DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 590 CE 051 213

AUTHOR Bacquelaine, Myriam; Raymaekers, Erik
TITLE Non-Formal Education in Developing Countries. Information File Number 10.
INSTITUTION International Bureau of Education, Geneva (Switzerland).
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Developing Nations; *Economic Development; Foreign Countries; *Nonformal Education; Nontraditional Education; *Role of Education

ABSTRACT

Over the past 15 years, developing countries have seen the number of training programs outside the formal education system multiply. The calling into question of schools is one of the factors explaining the recent interest in out-of-school education. Despite numerous attempts at clarification, there is a lack of unanimity with regard to the reality covered by nonformal education (NFE). The value of the battles over terminology, definitions, and classifications is that they reveal the diversity and dynamism of the field of NFE and the fact that many educational programs are in reality hybrids of NFE and formal education. Case studies represent a significant amount of the material published about NFE. These studies allow the identification of several general trends with respect to objectives pursued, target groups, and the most widespread program models per region. The cost of NFE is difficult to calculate, since there are no reliable, complete data in this sector. Problems with NFE resources include reliance on part-time, unpaid, volunteer instructors; mobilization of local resources; and program integration into the specific sociocultural context. Statistical data do not substantiate the claim that NFE necessarily fosters development. Furthermore, the two educational networks exist and are evolving independently in the majority of developing countries. Two reference lists offer 35 citations, and an annotated list of institutions has 11 entries. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AN INFORMATION SERVICE ON ISSUES AND TRENDS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Information file

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF EDUCATION, P.O.BOX 199, CH-1211 GENEVA 20 - TELEPHONE (022) 98.14.55 - TELEX 22644

ED300590

INFORMATION FILE, Number 10, 1987

NON-FORMAL EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

This document was specially written by Myriam Bacquelaine and Erik Raymaekers for the International Bureau of Education. It is available in English, French and Spanish. It can be freely translated into other languages and adapted for local use. We suggest that you use the above masthead identification. Please send to the IBE a copy of the issue of your journal carrying an Information file.

Erik Raymaekers is Director of the Research Unit Education and Development (URED) of the Saint Aloysius University, Brussels, and professor at the Catholic University of Louvain (KU-Leuven).

Myriam Bacquelaine, an educational scientist, is a researcher at the Research Unit Education and Development (URED) of the Saint Aloysius University, Brussels.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

V This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Fox

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

0405/2/3

The following titles have already appeared in the "Information file' series:

1. Primary education
2. Teaching methods in adult education
3. Reform and innovation in higher education
4. Science and technology education
5. In-service training of teachers
6. Educational administration: trends and issues
7. Secondary education in the world
8. Polytechnical education: issues and trends
9. Nutrition education in the 1980s
10. Non-formal education in developing countries

NON-FORMAL EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

1. The emergence of non-formal education in developing countries

Over the past fifteen years, developing countries have seen the number of training programmes outside the formal education system multiply. This expansion can be seen as related to the interest in the early 1960s among scientific and political circles, as well as in international and non-governmental organizations, in a form of education regarded as an indispensable complement to the current education system or as a potential substitute for the system as a whole. Such "non-institutional" educational programmes would pursue objectives not covered by schools and yet would correspond to genuine needs of the target populations. Because of their flexibility (short courses, diversity of teaching methods, reliance on local resources - both human and material), it was considered possible to reach segments of the population which were excluded from the formal process. Moreover, they would be less costly than current schools and would make an appropriate contribution to the satisfaction of endogenous development needs. In reality, these arguments in favour of out-of-school programmes mainly referred to the shortcomings of schools which had already been identified and which the school's critics were ready to point out.

Indeed, the role of the school, even as a factor in economic development, had been called seriously into question, especially in the late 1960s. Its weaknesses lay in terms of: structures, methods, contents and objectives; the high costs in both monetary terms (as much as 30% of the national budget in certain countries) and human terms (teachers in need of training, failure to cater to the educational needs of rural areas and of certain underprivileged segments of the population); the low rate of return; the increased demand due to the population explosion; and the shortage of monetary and human resources. All these argued strongly against the education system's monopoly as the means of training the labour forces of emergent nations, and cast doubt on the validity of the goal of elementary education for all, which, between 1960 and 1962, many countries had set for themselves (the conferences of Karachi, Beyrouth, Addis Ababa and Santiago). This undercurrent of criticism is typified in the following works: The world educational crisis: a systems analysis, by P.H. Coombs published in 1968 [6]; Deschooling society, by I.D. Illich in 1970 [15] and Pedagogy of the oppressed, by P. Freire in 1972 [12].

This calling into question of schools is one of the factors explaining recent interest in "out-of-school education". Additional factors contribute further to this nascent interest:

- the questioning by critics of the concept of development based on per capita growth of the gross national product, without taking into consideration income distribution or the satisfaction of the population's essential needs;

- recognition (at least at the conceptual level) of the fact that education and schooling are not synonymous and that education is an on-going process ("lifelong education"), as was emphasized by Unesco's International Commission on the Development of Education in its 1972 report [11].

- the World Congress of Ministers of Education on the Eradication of Illiteracy (Teheran, 1965), which drew attention to the need to educate adults, an area much neglected by institutionalized schools, and which crystallized in the launching, in the late 1960s, of a series of so-called "functional literacy" campaigns under the aegis of Unesco and UNDP in collaboration with national governments (Experimental World Literacy Programme, 1972 [10].

This interest in "out-of-school" education generated a multitude of experiments, particularly between 1970 and 1980, as attest the publications of this period, which primarily involved case studies.

However, the out-of-school approach to education, which in the early 1970s was given the name of "non-formal" education (NFE) (mainly to contrast it with "in-school" education also known as "formal" education (FE)), existed before the scientific world, international organizations and governmental and non-governmental organizations made it an object of study and experimentation, and even before the school became the dominant form of education.

Such is the case of endogenous traditional education, autochtonal education in Africa, for example, which, before the advent of colonialism, provided for the education of all youngsters and even today continues to provide for those children - frequently the majority of them - for whom there are no schools. The characteristics of this form of education are very similar to those attributed to NFE, such as its solid integration into the environment, the reliance on teachers from the local community, the absence of a specifically educative infrastructure, etc. [26].

During the colonial period, experiments were made with certain educational models differing from the traditional school. Such is the case of the adult literacy programmes launched in India around 1920 and of certain missionary schools which, in the former Belgian Congo for example, achieved a kind of integration of the formal and the non-formal.

It was in 1947 in Colombia that radio was used for the first time as a basic educational tool for the rural population. This model, "Radio Sutatenza" (established within the framework of the Acción Cultural Popular-ACPO Programme), inspired many later experiments in distance education.

2. The concept of non-formal education

Whereas the concept of formal education is a fact of life to which everyone can relate unambiguously, there is a lack of unanimity with regard to the reality covered by NFE, despite numerous attempts at clarification.

The complexity of the sphere of NFE, as illustrated by the numerous forms it may have adopted, as well as the difficulty of drawing a distinct borderline between FE and NFE, explain the many definitions of NFE which have been advanced.

These definitions, often formulated after the examination of a limited number of cases, merely deal with individual facets of a complex whole. As a result, the proposed characteristics of NFE are only fragmented properties valid for a very specific context and, hence, difficult to generalize to the entire field of NFE.

The nebulosity of the NFE term is further accentuated by the fact that it partly overlaps with certain other concepts, such as continuing education, adult education, functional literacy, distance teaching, etc., which at various times have been used as synonyms for NFE.

In addition to this, the choice of the phrase "non-formal education" has not been unanimously accepted, some people arguing, for example, that the word is a negative label and implies that the activities thus referred to have neither form nor structure. They prefer the terms "non-school" [22], or "out-of-school". The latter term, according to other authors, fails to encompass the totality of NFE activities, since some of them take place in schools, though outside normal classroom hours [7]. It might also be objected that using the term "non-formal" to designate any educational activity existing outside the education system is not completely accurate either, since in certain socialist countries, such as China, Cuba and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, there exist educational programmes which are in fact fully-fledged courses of study existing side-by-side with the education system for children. Bhola suggests that such parallel programmes be referred to as "substitute formal education" [4].

Some authors have attempted to clarify the concept of NFE by proposing typologies. These are mainly of two kinds: the classification of activities in the context of the entire field of education, in which case NFE would be one category; or the classification of NFE activities themselves within the overall field of non-formal education.

One of the most famous systems of classification was that proposed by the International Council for Educational Development (ICED), as part of a study on NFE programmes satisfying the needs of out-of-school rural youth [7]. The system defines education as a continuum and subdivides the continuum into three categories based on the degree of formalization of learning:

- Informal education: a veritable lifelong process by means of which the individual acquires attitudes, values, skills and knowledge through day-to-day experience, educative influences and the resources of his environment, that is, his family and neighbours, his work and his recreational activities, at the market place, the library and from mass media.

- Formal education: the hierarchically structured and chronologically organized education system extending from primary school to the university and including, in addition to general academic studies, a variety of specialized programmes and full-time technical and vocational training institutions.

- Non-formal education: any educational activity organized outside the established formal system - whether functioning separately or as a significant component of a broader activity - and designed to serve identifiable clientèles and educational objectives.

The definition of NFE suggested here is interesting by virtue of its conciseness and the fact that it is sufficiently broad to include a large number of activities. However, the system of classification itself can be criticized for considering the three modes of learning as separate entities when they can exist simultaneously, in the classroom for example - by far the most formal of situations [18] - or even overlap (such is the case with regard to traditional education, which, according to this classification, would be both formal and non-formal at one and the same time). The objection could also be raised that this approach sees education sometimes as a process and sometimes as an institution, whereas it can be both [19]. What is also noteworthy is the grouping of these three categories in relation to the school, implicitly recognized as the dominant educative model.

The latter is also a characteristic of the model prepared by Paulston. This author suggests an operational definition of educational activities in the formal and non-formal categories based on the contrasting of ten dimensions which are especially typical of school programmes (structures, content, cost, etc.) [23].

Many systems of classification within the field of NFE have also been attempted. On the basis of case studies and inventories of NFE experiments, these systems of classification rely on various criteria, such as the target clientèle, the objective pursued [1], and the underlying rural development theory [8].

Above and beyond the battle of terminology, definitions and classifications, the value of these efforts is that they reveal the diversity and dynamism of the field of non-formal education (for instance, the trend towards the formalization of NFE programmes once they become institutionalized) and the fact that many educational programmes are in reality hybrid forms of NFE and FE, or even informal education, which cannot be neatly confined to anyone of the categories proposed. This explains the obvious difficulty of establishing an absolute separation between different modes of learning.

3. Case studies and inventories

Case studies, the most extensive collection of which is without doubt that put together by ICED, represent a significant proportion of the material published. Essentially descriptive in nature, peppered with remarks and suggestions by the authors, rare are those which attempt a serious evaluation (qualitative especially) of the experiments studied. What is more, these works place particular emphasis on the educational dimensions of the programmes studied, with the risk of suggesting that every successful experience is transposable to any context, as if success were not conditioned by the social, political and economic setting [5]. The virtual non-existence of "extra-pedagogical" dimensions renders very difficult comparisons between the experiences described.

Systematic inventories within a circumscribed educative space, meanwhile, are few and far between. In addition to partial inventories compiled in connection with sector studies and dealing with specific ranges of activities (education and health, education and employment, etc.), several attempts at a more complete census-taking have been made. More specifically, the CEDEN (Centro para el Desarollo de la Educación No-formal) in Colombia conducted an inventory at the national level [17].

A similar effort was made in Rwanda during the same period [13]. In the early 1980s, inventories were attempted in Botswana, Cameroon, Lesotho, Mauritania [1] and in Brazil [13]. Making such inventories is especially difficult because of the number of different agents involved in the organization of educational programmes (various ministries, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, etc.), the problem of defining the contours of the activity of which a census is to be made, and the absence of systematized archiving procedures in the countries concerned (little scientifically-gathered data available concerning past and present experiments).

Nonetheless, these studies as a whole allow us to distinguish several general trends with respect to the objectives pursued, target groups, and the most widespread programme models per region.

4. The objectives of non-formal educational programmes

In many cases, the objectives assigned to NFE programmes reflect a sectorial outlook on development, and their relationship with the socio-economic and cultural context in which they are situated is not always clearly perceived. This tends to produce half-hearted interventions in the form of a series of limited, non-related efforts, particularly in the case of programmes sponsored by non-governmental organizations [14], as well as by international organizations, who institutionalized this sectorial outlook.

There are few programmes to provide basic education in rural areas, that is, training which combines the acquisition of sufficient practical skills to meet rural development needs and an indispensable minimum of theoretical knowledge. The majority of programmes focus on specific objectives in limited areas, without linkages among them, within a given territory. Thus, a large number of small programmes pursue objectives involving health or agriculture without ever combining these two sectors.

While literacy programmes exist in most countries, the post-literacy phase is not systematically planned for (few maintenance structures are provided via the rural press, a village library, etc.).

Most programmes concern vocational training, especially in agriculture. These programmes, the quality of which often leaves something to be desired (the training of personnel, identification of the real needs of the population, etc.), only reach a fraction of the potential clientèle [8].

Thus, rural areas, neglected in terms of formal education, appear to be poorly served in the area of non-formal education as well.

In urban areas, meanwhile, organized programmes focus on developing skills demanded by the modern (industrial and commercial) sector; they can be extremely formal in structure (qualified instructors, issuing of proficiency certificates, etc.) and they are generally organized by public authorities in association with employers.

Determining the objectives of NFE programmes poses the problem of identifying the genuine needs of the target population, particularly in rural areas where it would appear that a certain number of programmes are organized on the basis of supposed rather than real needs. Indeed, particularly in the case of projects implemented by non-governmental organizations, the design phase of programmes is carried without input from the population, who, if they are consulted at all, see their wishes reinterpreted by planners. In most cases, the planners are foreign to the context in which the programmes are to be implemented [14]. Such ignorance of the environment increases the chances of triggering resistance among the target population [3].

5. Target groups

Adults constitute the most common target group. Yet women, already disfavoured with regard to formal schools, appear to suffer a similar handicap in the case of NFE: their rate of participation in literacy programmes is low (due to socio-cultural reasons and domestic responsibilities); they are often restricted to activities considered typically feminine (by project planners) such as cooking, sewing, home economics, etc.; their role in agricultural production is overlooked (except with regard to subsistence farming); and the role of mothers as educators of the younger generation is rarely taken into consideration.

Hence, a large proportion of children - as many as 80% in certain countries - do not attend primary school, and very few "compensatory" programmes are organized for their benefit, as if only schools could satisfy this group's needs. Pre-school children, meanwhile, benefit indirectly from programmes intended for their mothers (nursery schools exist in some countries, but they are seen as preparatory to primary school and are to be found only in towns).

There are very few general education and vocational training programmes for out-of-school young people, and those that do exist are often ill-adapted to needs [7].

Thus, contrary to general belief, the most underprivileged groups vis-à-vis the formal education system are not necessarily those who benefit from the non-formal system. In actual fact, NFE programmes seem to be especially oriented towards persons with some educational background [7]; agricultural programmes, in particular, are more likely to affect the "medium" farmer rather than the "small" farmer [14] and, in urban areas, the middle class and a few categories of skilled manual worker are the ones to benefit from such learning programmes. Populations living on the periphery of urban areas seldom benefit from non-formal education [13].

6. General trends in NFE by region

In Latin America, two main trends are to be distinguished: vocational training for modern industry organized by non-governmental bodies (the SENAI in Brazil, the SENA in Colombia), on the one hand, and on the other, adult and adolescent literacy programmes, frequently in conjunction with consciousness-raising efforts (a model made popular by Paulo Freire in Brazil) via radio.

Africa presents diverse models focussing mainly on agricultural production and family education (health, nutrition, etc.) in rural areas (Rural Action in Senegal, Technical Refresher-Training Centres in Niger, the "Mères Animatrices" Programme in Mauritania, etc.). Although these programmes may enjoy ministerial support, they are not integrated into a concerted national rural development plan. Radio, because of its centralized character, is very little used in Africa (compare, however, the experiments in Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania).

NFE programmes in Asia, meanwhile, often focus on community development and are supported by national authorities. A certain number of countries have in fact even created an NFE department within the Ministry of Education (Indonesia, the Philippines) and have large-scale or even nationwide programmes. In addition, a regional NFE co-ordinating body has been set up.

7. The cost of NFE

It is difficult to calculate the cost of NFE, since there are no reliable, complete data on this sector.

There are several reasons for this, not the least of which is the diversity of the sources of funding. Although a programme can come under a single department (such as adult literacy, which is generally funded by the Ministry of Education), in the majority of cases programmes are financed by several ministries jointly (Health, Agriculture, etc.) and/or international and non-governmental organizations. It is likewise difficult to estimate the share of external sources of NFE funding, for NFE is often implicitly connected with various other areas of activity which are not recognized as educational in the strict sense of the word.

Another problem is the fact that the cost of NFE cannot be measured in strictly financial terms. Indeed, one of the characteristics of NFE is precisely its reliance on available local resources (both human and material). For example, volunteer instructors are called upon to perform the work rather than officially qualified and salaried teachers, and existing buildings and facilities are used (the instruction is not provided in premises specifically set aside for that purpose). An estimate of the direct and indirect costs of NFE must take these factors into consideration.

Given the diversity of programmes, drawing a general conclusion applicable to NFE as a whole is problematical. The cost of programmes probably varies considerably depending on the equipment used (television is more costly than radio), the input from the population, and the number of people benefiting from the training programme (per capita cost). In cases where NFE is structured in much the same way as school programmes, the cost will probably be equivalent (see, for example, industrial training programmes employing specialized staff and extremely specific tools and materials).

To give an illustration of this, a study conducted in Columbia involving 432 NFE projects showed that the funds allocated to NFE represented around one-third of the funds earmarked for primary education in the national budget - a considerable sum. The remuneration paid to instructors, meanwhile, was in general noticeably lower than that paid to teachers within the formal education system, and the number of volunteers was greater than the number of salaried staff [27].

The dilemma of the cost of NFE raises the problem of the optimal utilization of available resources. It would be interesting to determine, on the basis of small-scale, moderately inexpensive projects, what resources could and could not be used on a large scale (volunteer work, for example). This would make it possible to estimate the cost of NFE programmes at the national level and to make a comparison with the cost of formal education, provided the objectives are the same and their level is equivalent.

Some authors insist on the need of applying cost/benefit analysis to education [24]. While it is true that a comparison of the cost of NFE with that of FE is desirable, it must be borne in mind that cost/benefit analysis is not a magic formula for identifying with absolute certainty the most efficient, cost-effective education system. For one thing, it is difficult to quantify or measure many of the benefits of NFE, nor can they be expressed in monetary terms. They cannot, therefore, be included in a technical cost/benefit ratio analysis [21]. In addition, identifying the quantifiable benefits presupposes a basis of comparison, either at the national or international levels. Yet, what is valid for a given project or country is not necessarily valid for another [27].

It would be more beneficial to compare the cost of NFE and FE on the basis of a cost/effectiveness analysis [10], [21], since effectiveness can be expressed in non-monetary, yet not necessarily non-quantifiable, terms. The difficulty with this approach is that of formulating the objectives of the programme in such a way that the direct relationship between the means (costs) and the objectives can be clearly established [2].

8. NFE resources

Whereas relying on part-time, unpaid, volunteer instructors without formal qualifications (frequently members of the community) is often recognized as one of NFE's great advantages, it must be acknowledged that use of this resource is not without problems.

It happens that in many programmes the "volunteers" are primary school-teachers to whom additional duties are assigned (teaching adults to read and write, in particular) without any equivalent increase in pay. In most cases, the result is a token performance that does not have any significant impact on non-school activities, for want of time and motivation [9]. Furthermore, since they receive no special preparation for carrying out these tasks, they tend to replicate the conventional methods used in the formal education system. Nor do the other instructors employed on a project receive specific pedagogical training to carry out such activities. This being the case, they, too, tend to reproduce conventional teaching methods, i.e. those used for teaching young children. Thus, it may happen that training in the fields of health or agriculture takes the form of a lesson totally out of touch with the objectives sought and the learning behaviour of the intended audience, although the latter may express a desire to be instructed according to conventional teaching methods because they associate these with greater respectability [7].

The voluntary involvement of the community, meanwhile, is far from evident. A village chieftain may oppose the programme because he feels it will give the trainers from his community powers that rival his own [3] or certain craftsmen will refuse to share their knowledge, unless paid, on the grounds that they do not wish to train competitors.

Even more important than the problem of mobilization of local resources is that of the mere availability of such resources (either human or material) in the poorest regions [9].

These difficulties, which could curtail the impact of NFE, pose the problem of taking into consideration the real (and not presumed) needs of the populations concerned, and the integration of these programmes into the specific socio-cultural context in which they are implemented.

Another source of funding subject to debate is the financial contribution of persons benefiting from training programmes. The justification given is that, besides providing financial support to programmes which are frequently short of funds, self-financing of this sort sustains the motivation of participants. The validity of these arguments is questionable, given the fact that 20 or 30% of the national budget may already be swallowed up by formal education for the benefit of a minority, of whom no direct financial contribution is requested. And since NFE is supposed to benefit those excluded from schools, in general those with the least resources, would we not be running the risk of

excluding them from these programmes by charging fees? It must be said, however, that certain programmes have solved this problem by replacing fees with an exchange of services (a craftsman agrees to teach his trade in exchange for his own literacy training, for example).

It should be pointed out that not all programmes are beset with all these difficulties at once and some of them incorporate, from an educational point of view, original approaches worthy of closer consideration and which curriculum planners could use as a model.

9. NFE's contribution to development

The belief that NFE necessarily fosters development - and that it is an alternative solution to formal education - seems to be quite widespread, despite a lack of statistical data to substantiate this claim.

Most of the evaluations that do exist attempt to measure the short-term objectives achieved (quantitative, especially) and those which are closest to those of school programmes (reading, writing and arithmetic). The methods of evaluation employed also appear to be very similar to those adopted in formal education. An evaluation of the long-term impact of these programmes (beyond the actual training period) is rarely carried out, so that there are few answers to questions such as "Have the persons trained really played the role expected of them in community development?" "Has the health of the village's inhabitants been improved?" "Have agricultural innovations actually been put into practice?" "Has the rural exodus been slowed?" It is clear that the lack of evaluation and, hence, critical reassessment of these programmes hinders their improvement and leads to constant repetition of the same errors.

It would also be interesting to know why so few evaluations are carried out. Several explanations can be proposed: trainees are not conditioned to make evaluations; sponsors have no interest in long-term evaluation; programmes fall into oblivion once funding is cut; the evaluation phase is not perceived as an integral part of the programme and, as a corollary to this, the human and financial resources required for follow-up programmes are lacking; and central authorities do not always make provision for follow-up support structures, such as post-literacy programmes (a rural press, village library, etc.) or loan facilities to encourage self-employment. The latter factor may be due to the failure to take NFE into account in the educational planning process in particular, and in socio-economic development plans in general.

10. Interaction between FE and NFE

"The negative consequences of the dispersion of frequently scarce resources, the duplication of efforts and diminished effectiveness of educational activities due to the overlapping of activities and to the unbalances which inevitably result" [13] render effective co-ordination between the school system and non-formal educational activities more necessary than ever.

Yet, the coexistence of two educational "networks" evolving independently still seems to be the rule in the majority of developing countries. With the exception of a few models set in a specifically revolutionary context (Cuba, China and the United Republic of Tanzania), no satisfactory model of harmonious integration of FE and NFE resources exists at the national level. Attempts at linkages are often sporadic in nature - as part of a pilot study limited in time and space - or only envisage the institutional link within a specific field.

Interaction can take the form of a bridge connecting the two networks which aims to reintegrate into the school system those who were excluded from it (see the Philippine homologation and equivalency programme, the Costa Rican and Colombian occupational skills certification programmes). In reality, this approach subordinates NFE to FE, in no way calling the school system itself into question as a result, or offering a genuine alternative to it, since it has no goal of its own. This approach, therefore, fails to solve problems related to schools and does not bring about a genuine reallocation of resources.

The most visible link established between schools and NFE in many countries is the inclusion within the Ministry of Education of a department responsible for adult education (literacy in particular), without genuine interaction between the two systems. In this case again, the influence of FE on NFE is evident: adult instruction relies on the collaboration of teachers working outside their normal hours; classrooms left vacant in the evenings are utilized; and school principals act as the chairmen of literacy committees.

Community participation, meanwhile, considered to be one of NFE's major resources, is often limited in the context of FE to the construction or remodelling of school buildings.

Literature on the subject often speaks about the under-utilized sharing of equipment, human resources, methods and contents between FE and NFE. The theoretical possibilities of shared resources are sometimes made use of in a limited experiment of some kind. However, the reasons for which these potentialities are usually overlooked and the obstacles preventing interaction need to be pinpointed.

Integrated FE and NFE planning would certainly run into three fundamental obstacles: the fact that the Ministry of Education is not solely responsible for the co-ordination of activities; that of maintaining the flexibility of NFE programmes, and that of guaranteeing local involvement in the planning process [16]. These three factors call into question educational planning as it is currently known, in particular, its centralized and centralistic character. They presuppose that planning be intersectorial, that responsibility be distributed among the various administrative levels and including the actual organizer of educational activities, and that the role of the local community in the decision-making process be recognized [17].

What is more, interaction between FE and NFE would require prior organization of the non-formal education sector itself. Indeed, the activities of which it is composed are generally implemented without regard for co-ordination with already existing programmes, so that, far from being a coherent whole, the area of non-formal education resembles a vast mosaic whose constituent elements can be mutually inter-changeable or complementary, but they can also function as competitors or even be mutually exclusive. The organizational process should find better solutions to the needs of the population and base itself on cataloguing previous non-formal educational activities. Such an inventory, as the IIEP stressed [17], would only be the first step in a process whose second step would be to relate instructional opportunities to needs in order to measure their adequacy.

In reality, positive collaboration between FE and NFE would require that they be perceived as distinct forms of a greater whole - which is education, designed to serve the needs of society.

Finally, interaction between FE and NFE should not overlook the contributions of autochtonal education, which remains for many the only form of education they will ever know.

11. Conclusions

Whilst NFE, in principle, offers an attractive solution to the problems and shortcomings of schools, the many situations in which it has actually been put into practice permit cautious optimism at best.

It is vital that rigorous evaluation (in qualitative and quantitative terms) of the results achieved by these experiments should be carried out, as well as an identification of the factors responsible for failures.

In addition, an analysis of the obstacles to the effective integration of FE and NFE would make it possible to go beyond the merely theoretical feasibility report in literature on the subject. An analysis of reforms of the formal education system attempted in a certain number of countries (ruralization of schools, introduction of productive activities, pre-vocational training) will make it possible to suggest solutions for obstacles encountered by attempts at integration. The greatest obstacle is perhaps the social rewards, real for some, presumed for the majority, which schooling is supposed to bring. Indeed, schools function as a means of perpetuating the privileges of a minority which has no interest in the democratization of schools (through such measures as expanded enrolment, modification of contents, etc.). Deformalization of schools would constitute a threat to the privileges this minority derives from the present schools. As far as the groups mainly targeted by NFE (those excluded from schools) are concerned, they continue to perceive the school (and the diplomas it confers) as the promise of social and financial advancement, despite current evidence to the contrary (graduate unemployment). Hence, any model departing from the classical school model is considered to be "cheap education". A third stumbling block is probably the attitude of teachers, who regard any change in the current school structure (through such innovations as reliance on non-graduate personnel, the introduction of practical training) as a violation of their civil servant status, which at times is already precarious.

Above and beyond these obstacles, it would be of little worth to see in NFE a panacea containing the seeds of change and, in particular, bringing with it an improvement in the living conditions of the majority of the population. Such change cannot be achieved through education alone. It presupposes a genuine political commitment to promote it, as well as profound changes in socio-economic structures (more equitable distribution of wealth). This means that it would be illusory to look to education as an important source of development without also providing for a comprehensive programme to promote self-employment and thus guarantee that the abilities acquired are put to use. In the case of NFE in particular, subsidies (for rural areas especially) must be budgeted, fiscal and price policies must be adjusted so as not to discourage those who underwent training in the hopes of improving their lot - NFE, after all, should benefit the least favoured - and a loan policy must be implemented which will enable the most disfavoured to utilize the skills they have learned. The truth is that very often, when NFE programmes are launched, these conditions are not satisfied. As a result, unless policy changes are made in a great number of sectors, NFE programmes are doomed to have little or no impact.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **Allemano, E.** Non-formal education. RAMS Project (Rural Assessment Manpower Surveys). Washington, DC, Agency for International Development, 1981. 237 p.

2. **Balogh, T.; Streeten, P.P.** The coefficient of ignorance. Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Economics and Statistics, May 1963, p. 97-107.

3. **Belloncle, G.** La question éducative en Afrique noire. Paris, Karthala, 1984. 271 p.

4. **Bhola, H.S.** Non-formal education in perspective. Prospects (Paris), vol. 13, no. 1, 1983, p. 45-53.

5. **Bock, J.C.; Papagiannis, G.J.** The demystification of non-formal education. Amherst, MA, Center for International Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1976. 35 p.

6. **Coombs, P.H.** The world educational crisis: a systems analysis. New York, Oxford University Press, 1968. 241 p.

7. **Coombs, P.H.; Prosser, R.C.; Ahmed, M.** New paths to learning for rural children and youth. New York, International Council for Educational Development, 1973. 133 p.

8. **Coombs, P.H.; Ahmed, M.** Attacking rural poverty, how non-formal education can help. Baltimore, MD, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974. 292 p.

9. **Evans, D.R.** The planning of non-formal education. Paris, Unesco: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1981. 102 p. (Fundamentals of educational planning, 30)

10. The Experimental World Literacy Programme: a critical assessment. Paris, The Unesco Press, 1976. 198 p.

11. **Faure, E., et al.** Learning to be: the world of education today and tomorrow. Paris, Unesco; London, Harrap, 1972. 313 p.

12. **Freire, P.** Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, Herder & Herder, 1970. 186 p.

13. **Furter, P.** L'articulation de l'éducation scolaire et de la formation extrascolaire; problèmes relatifs au développement coordonné de l'éducation scolaire et non scolaire. Paris, Unesco, 1984. 83 p. (Etudes et documents d'éducation, no. 53)

14. **Gueneau, M.C.** Afrique: les petits projets de développement sont-ils efficaces ? Paris, L'Harmattan, 1986. 230 p.

15. **Illich, I.D.** Deschooling society. London, Calder & Boyars, 1971. 116 p.

16. **International Institute for Educational Planning.** Educational planning in the context of current development problems. Vol. I: An IIEP Seminar, Paris, 3-8 October 1983. Paris, 1984, p. 35-53,p. 81-92, p. 113-127.

17. **International Institute for Educational Planning.** The diversification of the educational field. In: Educational planning in the context of current development problems. Vol. II: Papers presented at an IIEP Seminar, Paris, 3-8 October 1983. Paris, 1985, p. 141-270.

18. **Labelle, T.J.** Non-formal and informal education: a holistic perspective on lifelong learning. International review of education (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff for the Institute for Education, Hamburg), vol. 28, no. 2, 1982, p. 159-175.

19. **Lê Thành Khôi.** Problématique des relations entre l'éducation formelle et non formelle. In: **Agence de coopération culturelle et technique.** Le formel et le non-formel dans l'éducation de masse. Paris, 1985, p. 1-13. (Alpha, no. 10)

20. **Levine, H.M.** Cost-effectiveness: a primer. Beverly Hills, CA, Sage, 1983. 168 p. (New perspectives in evaluation, vol. 4)

21. **Merrett, S.** The rate of return to education: a critique. Oxford economic papers (London), November 1966, p. 289-303.

22. **Michigan. State University. Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education.** Non-formal education: the definitional problem. East Lansing, MI, 1973. 46 p. (Its: Discussion papers, no. 2)

23. **Paulston, R.G.** Non-formal education: an annotated international bibliography. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1972. 332 p.

24. Psacharopoulos, G.; Woodhall, M. Education for development: an analysis of investment choices. New York, Oxford University Press, 1985. 337 p.

25. **Salifou, A.** L'éducation dans la société traditionnelle africaine. In: **Conférence africaine sur l'éducation, Niamey, 1981.** Faut-il changer l'école africaine ? Pourquoi ? Comment ? Morges, Suisse, Confédération mondiale des organisations de la profession enseignante, 1982, p. 17-31.

26. **Swett Morales, F.X.** Aspects of financing non-formal education. Prospects (Paris, Unesco), vol. 13, no. 1, 1983, p. 55-60.

27. **Vertonghen, R.; Rompuy, V. Van.** Sociaal-economische kosten-batenanalyse. Leuven, Belgium, ACCO, 1986. 213 p.

RECOMMENDED READING

Ahmed, M. The economics of non-formal education: resources, costs and benefits. New York, Praeger, 1975. 122 p.

Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development. Linking formal and non-formal programmes. Bangkok, Regional Office for Education in Asia and Oceania, 1979.

Brembeck, C.S.; Grandstaff, M. Non-formal education as an alternative to schooling. East Lansing, MI, Michigan State University, 1973. 25 p. (Michigan State University. Program of Studies in Non-formal Education. Discussion papers, no. 4)

Education and community self-reliance: innovative formal and non-formal approaches. Assignment children (Geneva, Unicef), no. 51/52, Autumn 1980. 223 p.

Fordham, P., ed. Participation, learning and change: Commonwealth approaches to non-formal education. London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1980. 223 p.

Gillette, A.L. Beyond the non-formal fashion: towards educational revolution in Tanzania. Amherst, MA, Massachusetts, Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts, 1977. 321 p.

Perraton, Hilary, ed. Alternative routes to formal education, distance teaching for school equivalency. Baltimore, MD, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982. 329 p.

Sheffield, J.R.; Diejomaoh, V.P. Non-formal education in African development. New York, African American Institute, 1972. 258 p.

SELECTED INSTITUTIONS ACTIVE IN THE AREA OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

International Bureau of Education - IBE
P.O. Box 199,
1211 Geneva 20,
Switzerland

The IBE publishes a quarterly newsletter entitled Educational innovation and information. In addition, the IBE documentation centre includes a number of works and studies related to NFE.

Unesco Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific
P.O. Box 1425
Bangkok 10500
Thailand

The regional office, within the framework of APEID (Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development), publishes the reports of workshops dealing with NFE experiments in Asian countries.

Center for International Education
University of Massachusetts
285 Hills House South
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003
United States of America

This centre publishes a series of studies (monographs) on NFE, a collection entitled "Issues in non-formal education" and the "Technical notes" series. These publications are available from the above address.

Commonwealth Secretariat
Marlborough House
Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5HX,
United Kingdom

The Commonwealth Secretariat has published reports based on conferences held in different regions of the world. The reports deal with experiments in NFE conducted in Commonwealth member states and may be obtained from the Secretariat's "Publications Section".

International Council for Educational Development (ICED)
P.O. Box 217
Essex Connecticut 06426,
United States of America

Since 1968 the ICED has published a significant collection of case studies related to experiments carried out in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These documents may be obtained directly from the ICED.

International Institute for Educational Planning - IIEP
7, rue Eugène-Delacroix
75016 Paris,
France

This Institute has published a number of works on the subject, such as the series "Fundamentals of educational planning". The IIEP is currently conducting research on the possibilities of interaction between Koranic and other schools. IIEP publications are available on loan. This institute's documentation centre also has an abundant collection of documents related to NFE.

Institut international de recherche, formation, éducation et développement (IRFED)
49, rue de la Glacière,
75013 Paris,
France

IRFED has published documents related to NFE and to rural development, particularly in French-speaking Africa. These documents may be obtained at the institute.

Office for International Networks in Education and Development (INET)
College of Education,
237 Erickson Hall,
Michigan State University,
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034,
United States of America

INET, formerly known as the Non-formal Education Centre, distributes a great number of its own publications, and issues a newsletter on education which includes an annotated bibliography. It also functions as a network for the exchange of documents throughout the world and answers all requests for documentation.

Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)
Education Division,
S-105 25 Stockholm,
Sweden

SIDA publishes a series called "Education Division documents", which concerns case studies in the field of NFE. These documents are available at the address indicated.

Unesco
7, place de Fontenoy,
75700 Paris,
France

Unesco publications in the area of NFE are numerous, but of particular interest are the Reports/Studies series prepared by the Development Studies Division, the collection "Studies and documents on education", the publications of the Division on Educational Structures, Contents, Methods and Techniques, and the series "Notes, comments . . .", edited in collaboration with UNICEF.

UNICEF
Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10,
Switzerland

Publications by Unicef in the area of NFE are also numerous and relate especially to the mother and child. The journal Assignment children publishes NFE case studies regularly.